EXHIBIT A

```
Case 1:19-cv-10151-LAK-QTW Document 39-1 Filed 11/18/20 Page 2 of 14

***SEALED - CONFIDENTIAL ***

Case: 19-2769 Document: 2-1 Filed: 09/13/2019 Pages: 261
                                                       Pages: 261
                                                                       (70 of 419)
                   IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                      NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
 2
                              EASTERN DIVISION
 3
     U.S. COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING ) Docket No. 15 CV 2881
     COMMISSION,
 4
              Plaintiff,
 5
                                          Chicago, Illinois
                                          March 22, 2019
                  VS.
                                           11:00 o'clock a.m.
 6
     KRAFT FOODS GROUP, INC., and
 7
     MONDELEZ GLOBAL, LLC,
 8
              Defendants.
                      *** SEALED -- CONFIDENTIAL ***
 9
10
           TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Settlement Conference
                BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN ROBERT BLAKEY
11
     APPEARANCES:
12
     For the Plaintiffs:
                                U.S. COMMODITY FUTURES
                                 TRADING COMMISSION
13
                                BY: MR. MICHAEL D. FRISCH
                                     MR. ROBERT T. HOWELL
14
                                525 West Monroe Street
                                Suite 1100
15
                                Chicago, Illinois 60661
16
     For the Defendants:
                                JENNER & BLOCK
17
                                BY:
                                    MR. J. KEVIN McCALL
                                     MR. DEAN N. PANOS
18
                                     MS. NICOLE A. ALLEN
                                353 North Clark Street
19
                                Chicago, Illinois 60654
20
                                SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP
                                BY: MR. GREGORY S. KAUFMAN
21
                                700 Sixth Street NW
                                Suite 700
22
                                Washington, DC 20001
23
                        Laura LaCien, CSR, RMR, CRR
24
                         Official Court Reporter
                  219 South Dearborn Street, Suite 1212
25
                         Chicago, Illinois 60604
                               (312) 408-5032
```

(71 of 419)

```
1
         (The following SEALED proceedings were had in court:)
 2
              COURTROOM DEPUTY: 15 C 2881, U.S. Commodity versus
 3
     Kraft.
 4
              THE COURT: Good morning, counsel. Appearances
 5
     please.
 6
              MR. FRISCH: Michael Frisch on behalf of the CFTC.
 7
    Good morning, your Honor.
 8
              MR. PANOS: Good morning, your Honor. Dean Panos;
 9
    and with me today is also counsel of record Kevin McCall,
10
    Greg Kaufman, Nicole Allen.
11
              THE COURT: Great. Are the parties ready for a
    settlement conference?
12
13
              MR. PANOS: We are, Judge.
14
             MR. FRISCH: Yes, your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: All right. This is how I handle
16
    settlement conferences: I just basically have the parties
17
    give consent to my procedures on the record, then we go off
    the record and, you know, it's a normal mediation-type
18
19
    format. Each side will have an opportunity together to just
20
    give a basic overview of how they see the case. Then the
21
    parties are separated and then I go back and forth between
22
    the parties and see if there's any common ground on it.
23
             If we settle the case, great. If we don't, that's
24
    also great. I get paid either way so -- but whatever
25
    happens -- a settlement conference is like Las Vegas.
```

Case: 19-2769 Document: 2-ID - CONFIDENTIAL ***

Pages: 261

(72 of 419)

Whatever happens stays here even if you settle the case. So anything I say during the settlement conference, anything the parties say during the settlement conference -- whether it's the joint session or the separate ex parte sessions -- is not admissible or even disclosable to anyone at any time in any pleading or at any cocktail party so that's a condition of going forward.

Additionally, just some expectation things, I'm not going to give advisory rulings. I don't have an interest in this case other than the rule of law. I'm happy to try the case. I'm happy to have the case settle. It doesn't really make any difference to me. The purpose of this session is not to give advisory rulings or give an idea of what I might do at a dispositive motion or a trial ruling. In fact, I can't even tell you what those answers would be anyway because I don't know what those answers are because those things are not in front of me and I haven't had an opportunity to have the benefit of the adversarial process and time to consider them. So if that's your hope in this, then you're going to be sadly disappointed.

I'm also not going to tell you either in the joint sessions or the separate sessions how good your case is because that's not useful. So if I, in a session, start talking about litigative risks or something else, don't interpret that I have anything against your case because I

Case: 19-2769 Document: 2-1 Filed: 09/13/2019 Pages: 261 (73 of 419)

don't. And if you were in the session with the other side, you would probably feel differently because I'm going to discuss with both sides areas of concern.

Any objection to proceeding in that fashion?

MR. FRISCH: No, your Honor.

MR. PANOS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. If both sides consent to the settlement conference, then we'll go ahead and do that.

All right. We're off the record.

(Discussions had off the record, after which the following proceedings were had in open court at 3:50 p.m.:)

THE COURT: All right. Calling the case 15 CV 2881, U.S. Commodity versus Kraft.

The parties have engaged in a settlement conference over the last almost five hours, have reached an agreement regarding the materials terms. Please listen carefully to make sure I haven't forgotten something. Okay. The Court is going to articulate the material terms for the record and then I'll ask each side to indicate whether or not these are, in fact, the material terms of the settlement and if there are any clarifications, revisions or other terms that I did not mention, failure to clarify to the Court or add the terms will waive those.

Item one. The parties will prepare for the Court's signature a consent judgment that will be public.

Case: 19-2769 Docume SEALED - CONFIDENTIAL 019 Pages: 261

(74 of 419)

There will be no pre-dismissal of any counts. Number two.

Number three. The consent judgment will have a general reference to the procedural posture of the case. It will include what the allegations are, the defendant's denial of those allegations and the fact that the parties have agreed to resolve those matters. The consent judgment would not have historical, and by "historical" I mean findings of fact regarding what happened in the past, nor would it have legal conclusions regarding what happened in the past.

There would be a monetary penalty in the amount of \$16 million payable by the defendant to the plaintiff payable in full within 90 days. There would also be an agreement of prospective injunctive relief which would trace the general language of the statute and regulations as alleged and the parties would agree that there would be no violation of these sections in the future.

There would be a mutual confidentiality clause that would read as follows in verbatim as follows, not in -- I'm not paraphrasing; I'm quoting: Neither party shall make any public statement about this case other than to refer to the terms of this settlement agreement or public documents filed in this case, except any party may take any lawful position in legal proceedings, testimony or by court order.

The Court itself has final approval over the actual

Case: 19-2769 Document Pages: 261 (75 of 419)

```
written agreement. So once the parties submit this public
1
2
    consent judgment, the Court has to agree that it is a lawful
3
    order that I can enter. If I choose not to sign it, this
4
    agreement is no longer binding.
5
             Also, a material term is that the Commission itself
6
    has to -- pursuant to its rules and regulations has to agree
7
    to the settlement. That would essentially be an up or down
8
    vote. They would not have the power to unilaterally change
9
    the material terms.
10
             Are there any material terms that I forgot to
11
    mention or any clarification on behalf of the plaintiff?
12
             MR. McCALL: Yes, your Honor. One clarification.
13
             THE COURT: On behalf of the plaintiff.
             MR. HOWELL: Robert Howell on behalf of the CFTC.
14
    Those terms sound okay with the CFTC.
15
             THE COURT: They what?
16
             MR. HOWELL: They're okay to the CF -- that's -- we
17
    agree.
18
             THE COURT: Okay. There are no other material terms
19
20
    that I failed to mention, correct?
             MR. HOWELL: Correct.
21
22
             THE COURT: There are no changes to the terms as
23
    articulated, correct?
24
             MR. HOWELL: Correct.
             THE COURT: Okay. On behalf of defense?
25
```

Case: 19-2769 Documentes EALIED - CONFIDENTIAL 2019 Pages: 261 (76 of 419)

MR. McCALL: The one change -- with respect to -THE COURT: You got to give your -- you got to say
your name, counsel.

MR. McCALL: I'm sorry. Kevin McCall on behalf of defendants.

With respect to the issue of the injunction that says we won't violate -- it's agreeable if it says we won't violate the Commodities Exchange Act or the provisions thereof not reciting specific provisions.

THE COURT: No. Nope. That's not the deal I offered. My offered deal, it was a general language regarding using -- tracing the statutory language prospectively that was alleged in the case so you're agreeing that you will not violate the law.

MR. McCALL: We're agreeing that we won't violate the -- we're not agreeing that we're not going to violate the anti-manipulation provisions.

MR. PANOS: Again --

THE COURT: All right. Hang on a second, counsel,
Hang on a second, counsel. You're saying you're not going to
agree to follow the law if I -- if I do a specific section of
the law? Is there some section of the law that you think you
can violate in the future?

MR. McCALL: No, no.

THE COURT: Why don't you take a second and talk to

```
1
    co-counsel?
 2
             MR. McCALL: Sure.
 3
             MR. PANOS: That wasn't what he was saying.
             THE COURT: Well, clarify it because that's what it
 4
 5
    sounded like.
 6
        (Brief pause.)
 7
             MR. McCALL: No. We're saying -- we're agreeing
 8
    that we won't violate the Commodities Exchange Act in its
 9
    entirety. That's what we're saying. We're not agreeing that
10
    we're not going to violate some specific provision of the
11
    Commodities Exchange Act because we don't want the
12
    implication that there's -- that this settlement is some
13
    acknowledgment that there's been some violation of the
    Commodities Exchange Act.
14
15
             THE COURT: There is no -- based on the discussion
16
    the Court had, there was no agreement that there was any
17
    violations in the past. If you're -- if you believe that
18
    agreeing that specific portions of the law you're not going
19
    to agree that you would not violate on a prospective basis,
20
    I'm finding that hard to believe but that's your choice so
    all dates and deadlines to stand.
21
22
             MR. PANOS: Your Honor --
23
             THE COURT: The settlement is not going forward.
24
             MR. PANOS: Your Honor, that's not what he said with
25
    all due respect.
```

```
1
             THE COURT: He's saying -- No. He's saying that
    there are -- he doesn't want to cite specific provisions of
 2
 3
    the law that they will not -- that they will abide by
 4
    specific provisions of the law in the future, right?
 5
             MR. PANOS:
                        No.
 6
             MR. McCALL: Well --
 7
             MR. PANOS: No. I don't -- I think we have a
 8
    miscommunication.
 9
             THE COURT:
                         Okay. Why don't you articulate what you
10
    think it is and then see if he agrees?
11
             MR. PANOS: Let me try.
12
             MR. McCAll: Let's have a minute.
13
             THE COURT: Okay.
14
             MR. PANOS: Can I try?
15
             MR. McCALL: Yeah. Go ahead.
16
             MR. PANOS: All right. I think what we're saying as
    we understand it is that the agreement would say that
17
    defendants agree that they will not violate any -- any of the
18
19
    provisions in the Commodities Exchange Act, any or -- any
    specific ones if that's what they're asking for --
20
21
             THE COURT: Yes. That is what exactly what they're
22
    asking for.
             MR. PANOS: Okay. That wasn't -- by the way, we
23
    hadn't had that -- you said the general language because
24
25
    usually it is.
```

Case: 19-2769 Document 2-1ED - CONFIDENTIAL 19* Pages: 261 (75% of 419)

1 THE COURT: I said it was general language in 2 respect it would not be specific language regarding positions 3 you would take in futures -- not specifically factual but it would trace the general language of the statute provisions 4 5 that were alleged in this case. 6 MR. PANOS: And that we've denied those allegations. 7 THE COURT: There's nothing that says that you --8 MR. PANOS: And I think that --9 THE COURT: As a factual matter, you've denied that 10 you violated in the past. 11 MR. PANOS: Right. 12 THE COURT: There is no legal determination in this 13 agreement that you violated in the past. You will agree to 14 abide by the law, including specific provisions of the code 15 going forward. If that's not -- if that's insufficient, tell 16 me now, counsel. 17 MR. PANOS: Give me a second, Judge. 18 (Brief pause.) 19 MR. PANOS: We agree, Judge. 20 THE COURT: All right. Both parties agree. 21 material terms are on the record. What's a -- can you look 22 at your calendar and look for about a date about, what do you 23 think, 30 days out to finalize the paperwork? How long do 24 you need?

*** SEALED - CONFIDENTIAL ***

MR. PANOS: 30 is fine for us, your Honor.

25

```
1
             MR. HOWELL: Just to be clear, as you know, we have
 2
    to have the Commission approval so is this to get the -- I
 3
    mean --
 4
             THE COURT: This is just to finalize the document
 5
    that puts in writing what we just said.
 6
             MR. HOWELL: Okay. We can do that. The Commission
 7
    can take longer.
 8
             MR. PANOS: I mean, yeah, we don't care about the
 9
    cadence in terms of which comes first. Obviously, we only
    wanted to do this one time if we can.
10
11
             MR. HOWELL: Typically -- sorry. So the Commission
12
    has to approve it before it goes to the Court and so we would
    ask for additional time.
13
14
             THE COURT: How much time do you need? I'll give
15
    you any date you want.
16
             MR. HOWELL: 60.
17
             THE COURT: You want 90?
             MR. HOWELL: 60 should be fine.
18
             THE COURT: Kristina, can you grab me a 60-day date?
19
20
    She had a 30-day date ready.
21
             LAW CLERK: May 24th. Is that a court date, Judge?
22
             THE COURT: I need to check -- hang on a second,
23
    counsel.
24
        (Brief pause.)
             THE COURT: How about May 21st at 9:45?
25
```

```
1
    good?
 2
             MR. HOWELL: Yeah. I'm wondering if it makes sense
 3
    to set a period of time for us to work out the agreement and
 4
    then for time.
 5
             THE COURT: You don't need adult -- I mean, you
 6
    don't need parental supervision of that? Come on now.
 7
             MR. HOWELL: We just --
 8
             MR. PANOS: I don't, Judge, but Mr. Howell --
 9
             THE COURT: Look at that, I got all aggressive and
10
    everything. No; I'm kidding.
11
             MR. HOWELL: We just need to make sure we have
12
    enough time to circulate to the Commission. So if we don't
13
    reach agreement, we're going to --
14
             THE COURT: How about May 28th?
15
             MR. PANOS: That might be Memorial Day.
16
             THE COURT: I don't know if you need 90, counsel.
17
        (Brief pause.)
18
             MR. HOWELL: Apparently May 28th is -- will work.
19
             THE COURT: All right. May -- I'm setting the
    status May 28th at 9:45. If you all submit the paperwork and
20
21
    give me time to review it and enter it, I'll strike the date.
22
    Sound good?
23
             MR. PANOS:
                        Thank you, your Honor.
24
             MR. HOWELL: Thank you, your Honor.
25
             THE COURT: All right. All other dates and
```

Case 1:19-cv-10151-LAK-OTW Document 39-1 Filed 11/18/20 Page 14 of 14

Case: 19-2769 DocumersEALED - CONFIDENT/ACL Pages: 261 (823 of 419)

```
deadlines are stricken pending further order.
 1
     Congratulations, everybody. Have a great weekend.
 2
 3
              MR. HOWELL: Thank you, your Honor.
 4
              MR. PANOS: Thank you, your Honor.
 5
         (Which concluded the proceedings in the above-entitled
 6
     matter.)
 7
                         CERTIFICATE
              I hereby certify that the foregoing is a transcript
 8
     of proceedings before the Honorable John Robert Blakey on
 9
10
     March 22, 2019.
11
12
     /s/Laura LaCien
                                          March 29, 2019
13
     Laura LaCien
                                                 Date
     Official Court Reporter
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```